



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,024	10/19/2001	Ercan E. Kuruoglu	110915	7124

27074 7590 09/18/2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC.
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 09/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/982,024	Applicant(s) KURUOGLU ET AL.	
	Examiner CESAR B. PAULA	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE filed on 6/22/2006.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, and 8 are independent claims.

3. The rejection of claim 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma, in view of Kurosawa et al, hereinafter Kurosawa (Pat. # 6,751,779 B1, 6/15/04, filed on 3/20/2000), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 10/19/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 17-18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ma et al, hereinafter Ma (Pat.# 5,909,805 B2, 6/21/2005, filed on 1/31/2001).

Regarding independent claim 1, Ma discloses scanning a document containing printed text, and handwritten annotations—*capturing an original image of a document* -- (col. 3, lines 57-62, fig.1).

Moreover, Ma discloses separating annotations from printed text, and the detection of the handwritten annotations in the document—*detecting the annotations which were made to the document before or prior to capture* -- (col. 4, lines 3-11, fig.1).

Furthermore, Ma discloses the saving of the extracted handwritten annotations into memory—*generating a summary of a document by extracting lesser portions of the image document identified by the detected annotations, the summary including only the extracted portions of the document and being generated as a separate electronic image document that is different from the original image* -- (col. 7, lines 52-61, fig.7-8).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Ma discloses the saving of the extracted handwritten annotations from the scanned document, into memory—*generate a summary of the same document as that on which the annotations are detected* —(col. 7, lines 52-61, fig.7-8).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Ma discloses the saving of the extracted handwritten annotations from the scanned document, into a new document in memory—*generate*

Art Unit: 2178

a summary of a different document as that on which the annotations are detected—(col. 7, lines 52-61, fig.7-8).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Ma discloses the storage of extracted text from the scanned document, which contains the handwritten annotations, to serve as an original document—*capture an image of a second document to be summarized based on detected annotations from a first document* (col. 8, lines 1-30, 48-67, col.14, lines 16-45, fig.1, 4).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Ma discloses the generation of a region of bounding boxes, in the scanned document, used for extracting the handwritten annotations—*image region associated with a detected annotation* -- (col. 3, lines 57-col.4, line 11, fig.1, 3A-B).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 5, Ma discloses the generation of a region of bounding boxes of sentences for which the annotations have been written, in the scanned document, and which are used for extracting the handwritten annotations—*image region associated with a detected annotation, the image region represents a sentence in the document image to provide context for the identified annotation* -- (col. 3, lines 57-col.4, line 11, fig.1, 3A-B).

Claims 8-13 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 1-6 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 1, Ma discloses the saving of the extracted handwritten annotations from the scanned document, into memory-- *extracting image maps of the original image of the document.* (col. 7, lines 52-61, fig.7-8).

Claim 18 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 8, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 7, and 15-16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma, in view of Kurosawa et al, hereinafter Kurosawa (Pat. # 6,751,779 B1, 6/15/04, filed on 3/20/2000).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Ma discloses the saving of the extracted handwritten annotations from the scanned document, into a new document in memory (col. 7, lines 52-61, fig.7-8). Ma fails to explicitly disclose: *a summary comprising portions which are selectively expandable to increase the information in that portion of the summary.* However, Kurosawa teaches the inserting a series of characters located in document lines into a document

Art Unit: 2178

(col.6, lines 40-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combined Ma, and Kurosawa, because Kurosawa teaches the reducing of burdens put upon an editor of a document, by using simple operations (col. 1, lines 59-67, and col.2, lines 28-53).

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 1, Ma discloses the saving of the extracted handwritten annotations from the scanned document, into a new document in memory (col. 7, lines 52-61, fig.7-8). Ma fails to explicitly disclose: *the summary includes expandable detail levels*. However, Kurosawa teaches the inserting a series of characters located in document lines into a document, either by going over, or staying within a certain range—*expandable detail levels* (col.6, lines 40-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combined Ma, and Kurosawa, because Kurosawa teaches the reducing of burdens put upon an editor of a document, by using simple operations (col. 1, lines 59-67, and col.2, lines 28-53).

Claim 16 is directed towards a method for implementing the apparatus found in claim 15, and therefore is similarly rejected.

9. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma, in view of Kupiec (Pat. # 6,533,822 B2, 3/18/03, filed on 1/30/98, as disclosed in pto-892 mailed on 8/25/04).

Claim 14 is directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claim 7, except that Ma fails to explicitly disclose *hidden portions which are selectively expandable*. However, Kupiec teaches the generation of a summary along with indicators that indicate and display the location where extracted text was originally located (col.1, lines 26-67, fig.4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ma, and Kupiec, because of all the reasons found in Kupiec, including avoiding the scanning of the whole document to find parts of the document that corresponding to portions of the summary (col.1, lines 14-67), and therefore is similarly rejected.

10. Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma, in view of Lerner et al, hereinafter Lerner (Pat.# 6,859,909, 2/22/2005, filed on 3/7/2000).

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 1, Ma discloses the saving of the extracted handwritten annotations from the scanned document, into a new document in memory (col. 7, lines 52-61, fig.7-8). Ma fails to explicitly disclose: *the summary includes at least one of a pointer and address indicating a place in the original image of the document from which the extracted portions are extracted*. However, Lerner that the storing a list of x and y coordinates of the locations where the user draws the annotations (col. 15, lines 27-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combined Ma, and Lerner, for all the reasons listed by Lerner including the effective integration of text, ink, and

highlighter to annotate web documents (col. 1, lines 26-36), thereby making the web page easier to share the user's thoughts, and make it more interactive.

Claim 20 is directed towards a method for implementing the apparatus found in claim 19, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 6/5/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claims 1, and 18, Applicants submit that Ma does not teach or suggest detecting annotations made to the document prior to image capture, and extracting lesser portion of the image of the document (pages 5-6). The Examiner disagrees, Ma teaches the extraction of annotations made to the margin of a document, and save all the annotations together on memory (col. 4, lines 3-11, col. 7, lines 52-61, fig.1, 7-8). In other words, the annotations made to the document before it was scanned are extracted from the document, thereby only extracting the annotations and not the whole document.

Regarding claims 7, and 14-16, the Applicants state that Kurosawa does not teach a summary comprising hidden portions (page 7, parag.3-5). The Applicants are directed towards the rejections of this limitation in light of the newly found reference.

Claims 2-7, and 9-16 depend from claims 1, and 18, and therefore are rejected at least based on the same information above.

Art Unit: 2178

Conclusion

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
9/14/06